

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 6-7 have been canceled. Claims 1-5 and 7-21 are pending, of which claims 1-5, 10-16, and 18-20 have been amended. The amendments to claims 1-5, 10-16, and 18-20 are simply to provide clarification and/or to correct informalities noted by the Applicant, and are not to overcome prior art or any other objections.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-17 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blaze et al., "Decentralized Trust Management" (hereinafter, "Blaze"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,467 to Gong (hereinafter, "Gong") (*Office Action* p.4). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in pertinent part:

identifying a first condition for association with the permission set, wherein the first condition references a first element of evidence, *wherein the first element of evidence is implicitly trusted*;

identifying a second condition for association with the permission set, wherein the second condition references a second element of evidence, *wherein the second element of evidence is initially untrusted*;

1  
2                   ...  
3                   *determining whether the second element of evidence should*  
4                   *be trusted based on the first condition; [emphasis added]*

5           In an example implementation based on claim one, a first condition may be,  
6           “the data request includes user A’s public key.” A first element of evidence,  
7           referenced in the first condition, is user A’s public key. As recited in claim 1, user  
8           A’s public key is implicitly trusted. If a data request is received from user A, and  
9           includes user A’s public key, then the first condition is satisfied.

10          Carrying the example further, a second condition may be, “the data request  
11          includes a trusted public key other than user A’s public key.” A second element of  
12          evidence is a public key other than user A’s public key.

13          Now assume a data request is received from user B that includes user B’s  
14          public key. Because user A’s public key is not included, the second condition  
15          applies, and user B’s public key is initially untrusted. However, if the received  
16          user B’s public key was signed using user A’s public key (which is implicitly  
17          trusted), then a determination may be made that user B’s public key (the second  
18          element of evidence) is also to be trusted.

19          As illustrated, the first element of evidence, which is referenced by the first  
20          condition, is implicitly trusted; the second element of evidence, which is  
21          referenced by the second condition is initially untrusted; and a determination of  
22          trust associated with the second element of evidence is made based on the first  
23          condition.

1 Neither Blaze nor Gong teach or suggest "determining whether the second  
2 element of evidence should be trusted based on the first condition," wherein "the  
3 first element of evidence is implicitly trusted," and "the second element of  
4 evidence is initially untrusted," as recited in claim 1. Blaze describes an example  
5 use of a PGP certificate system in which user B generates a public key/private key  
6 pair. Another user, user A, has a copy of user B's public key, which user A  
7 believes is valid. User A then signs the copy of user B's public key and sends the  
8 signed public key to a third user, user C.

9 The Office claims Blaze teaches the features of claim 1 by equating A's  
10 verifiable digital signature on B's key to the first condition, and A's public/private  
11 key pair to the first evidence; and further more by equating "A to verify  
12 trustworthiness of B's key" to the second condition, and the "digital signature of  
13 A" as the second element of evidence. (*Office Action* p. 4-5)

14 Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office's interpretation of Blaze in  
15 relation to claim 1. First, in the conditions and elements of evidence cited by the  
16 Office, the cited first element of evidence is not referenced by the first condition,  
17 nor is the cited second element of evidence referenced by the second condition.  
18 Furthermore, Blaze describes a scenario in which user C trusts data received from  
19 user A, and therefore, trusts user B's public key when it is received from user A.  
20 Claim 1, however, covers a scenario that is not described in Blaze, in which user C  
21 may receive data from user B (which is initially untrusted), but may determine to  
22 trust the received data if it includes user A's public key, which is implicitly  
23 trusted.  
24  
25

1 Gong does not add anything to the teaching of Blaze with regard to the  
2 cited elements of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over  
3 the Blaze-Gong combination for at least the reasons described above, and  
4 Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

5  
6 Claims 2-5 and 8-10 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim  
7 1, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

8 Claims 6 and 7 are cancelled, rendering the rejection of claims 6 and 7  
9 moot, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

10 Independent claim 11 recites elements similar to those recited in claim 1.  
11 Accordingly, claim 11 is allowable over the Blaze-Gong combination for at least  
12 the reasons described above with reference to claim 1, and Applicant respectfully  
13 requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

14 Claim 12 is allowable by virtue of its dependence on claim 11, and  
15 Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

16 Independent claims 13, 14, 15, and 17 each recite elements similar to those  
17 recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claims 13, 14, 15, and 17 are each allowable over  
18 the Blaze-Gong combination for at least the reasons described above with  
19 reference to claim 1, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be  
20 withdrawn.

21 Claim 16 is allowable by virtue of its dependence on claim 15, and  
22 Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

23 Claims 19-21 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 17, and  
24 Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.  
25

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blaze in view of Gong, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,678 to Itoh et al. (hereinafter, "Itoh") (*Office Action* p.10). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 18 depends from claim 17. As discussed above, the Blaze-Gong combination does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 17. Itoh is cited as disclosing a problem solving apparatus using state transition, and does not add anything to the teachings of Blaze and Gong with reference to claim 17. Accordingly, claim 17 is allowable over the combination of Blaze, Gong, and Itoh, and claim 18 is allowable by virtue of its dependency on claim 17. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

Pending claims 1-5 and 8-21 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned agent before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 6/29/05

By: Kayla D. Brant  
 Kayla D. Brant  
 Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
 Reg. No. 46,576  
 (509) 324-9256 x 242